

Turning now to the subject matter of amended claims 1, 6 and 7, each of the claims now sets forth that the intrusion detection system operates by comparing “in a semantic manner and independently of the syntax of the activity” various actions so as to identify an intrusion or attempted intrusion. In other words, in contrast to the system of Pearson which clearly relies on the syntax, i.e. the actual characters, of a message, the intrusion detection system of the present invention specifically is required to operate in a manner independently of the syntax of activity on the network. Thus, claims 1, 2 and 6 are novel over the disclosure of Pearson. Clearly, Pearson specifically requires that the syntax of the message is the basis for determination as to whether or not the communication corresponds to a known security risk. In contrast, the present invention uses general rules to identify an intrusion in a semantic manner as opposed to in dependence on the syntax of a message. The use of semantic determination of intrusion attempts provides significant advantages as the occurrence of false positives can be reduced or even avoided and the proportion of intrusion attempts that are caught can be significantly increased.

There is no disclosure or suggestion in Pearson of the use of semantic determination of intrusion attempts and, indeed, quite the opposite methodology is presented. There is therefore no reason why a skilled person starting from Pearson would make the modifications required to bring the system of Pearson to within the scope of new claims 1, 6 and 7.

Dependent claims 2 to 5, 9 and 10 are all dependent at least on one or more of the independent claims and are therefore novel and inventive by virtue of this dependence.

It is suggested that all the grounds for rejection raised in the office action have been addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Carl Oppedahl  
PTO Reg. No. 32746